REMARKS

In the Official Office Action of April 2, 2003, the Examiner has objected to the title. Accordingly, the title has been amended to state that the invention relates to a method. The Abstract has also been objected to for the same reason and has been amended to relate to a method.

The cross-reference has been updated to state that the present application is a division of U.S. Serial No. 09/244,711 and the patent number thereof, i.e. 6,423,418 has been inserted. Page 7, line 20 of the specification has also been corrected to read --atoms--.

Claims 10 through 18 have been rejected for various reasons as set forth on pages 4 through 6 of the Official Action and inasmuch as claims 10 through 16 have been amended, it is deemed that these various objections have been rendered moot. Claims 17 and 18 have been cancelled without bias or prejudice inasmuch as the coatings can be used for ~~these~~ DRY ERASE, WALLCOVERING, and other purposes.

Amended claim 10 relates to a method in which a polyoxetane having a carboxylic acid end group is reacted with either a polyester, or with polyester forming monomers such as a dicarboxylic acid and a polyol, with the subsequently formed block copolymer being reacted with an amino resin to cure the same.

In view of the amended claims, the inventorship must be changed and the necessary documents are being prepared and shall be submitted in the near future.

Claims 10, 11, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hargis, U.S. Patent 5,674,951. It is respectfully submitted that Hargis is not pertinent.

The Hargis reference relates to a coating composition wherein a polyoxetane is first reacted with a polyisocyanate to create an isocyanate terminated polyoxetane which is then reacted with a polyether or a polyester to form block copolymers via an urethane or isocyanate linkage; see for example the Abstract, the Summary of the Invention, and Column 2, lines 32-48. These block copolymers can subsequently be crosslinked with mono, di, tri, and tetra functional amines, see Column 5, lines 41-57.

The Hargis reference is not pertinent because it does not teach or suggest, nor is there any motivation, to react a hydroxyl terminated polymer such as a polyester with a carboxylic acid terminated polyoxetane. Furthermore, the Hargis reference cannot teach or suggest Applicants' claimed amino resin which serves as a crosslinking agent since it is chemically different than an amine compound. Moreover, the block copolymer of Hargis is terminated with an isocyanate end group, see the bottom of Column 2 and top of Column 3, and thus will react with a polyamine whereas the hydroxyl or carboxylic acid terminated polymers of the present invention do not react with amine groups.

In summary, Hargis contains no suggestion to delete the polyisocyanate groups which form a urethane polymer, contains no suggestion to react a polyoxetane having an acid end group directly with a polyester, and contains no

suggestion to delete a polyamine and substitute an amino crosslinking agent therefore.

Claims 10 through 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pate, U.S. Patent 4,603,074, in view of Hargis and Heilmann, U.S. Patent 4,931,582.

Pate merely relates to reacting a polyester having hydroxyl end groups with an amino resin. Pate is not pertinent in that it contains no suggestion of utilizing a fluorinated polyoxetane polymer, does not teach reacting any such polyoxetane having an acid end group with a polyester, or of reacting any polyoxetane polyester copolymer with an amino crosslinking agent.

Inasmuch as the Hargis reference relates to reacting a polyoxetane with a polyisocyanate to create an isocyanate terminated fluorine containing polyoxetane, there is no suggestion of Applicants' claimed invention. A fortiori, Pate would have to be modified to include a polyoxetane and Hargis would have to be modified to delete any reaction with a polyisocyanate, both such methods being antipodal to their teachings. It is thus respectfully submitted that there is no motivation to modify Pate and/or Hargis in a manner of which flies in the face of their respective teachings.

Heilmann is not pertinent inasmuch as it merely relates to the fact that fluorinated polymers generally have stain resistant properties.

Claim 18 has been rejected based upon Pate in view of Hargis, Heilmann and Barnwell, U.S. Patent 3,922,457. While Barnwell may teach the fluoro

coatings have been used to form dry-erase surfaces, Applicant' process claims are not taught for the same reason set forth hereinabove.

Claims 12 and 14-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based upon Hargis as a primary reference in view of Pate and Heilmann. For the same reasons as set forth hereinabove, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of these references go against the teaching of each reference and are contrary thereto. Based upon the above arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of such references in a manner as suggested by the Patent Office would severely alter the chemistry of the Hargis and Pate references in a manner which they simply cannot teach or suggest.

In view of the above amendments and arguments, a Notice of Allowances of claims 10-16 and 27-43 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

HUDAK, SHUNK & FARINE CO. LPA

Daniel J. Hudak

By: Daniel J. Hudak
Registration No.: 25,879

DJH/lb

2020 Front Street, Suite 307
Cuyahoga Falls, OH 44221-3257
(330) 535-2220
Attorney Docket No.: GT-4684 (GC-EU-CIP-DIV)